REDACTED

Exhibit 5 to the
Declaration of Sarah Hoiland
ECF Nos. 41 and 46

RE: NNN Proposal 2019

ESTHER.WILDER

Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2019 1:38 AM
To: Sarah Hoiland [sarah.hoiland0927@gmail.com]
Attachments: IP License and Release (1).docx (61 KB)

Dear Sarah,

There has been a lot of miscommunication here, but I also hope you can appreciate my perspective. You claim that I am "insulting [your] integrity based on misinformation that goes beyond the grant or any publications." But from my perspective, you have wrongfully asserted control of what rightfully belongs to me, and you have inaccurately portrayed what transpired.

While you have apologized for the problems with the presentation, I think you should take some action to remedy this situation (such as writing to the organizers and requesting that they include my name as a coauthor in their records, for example).

Regarding the emails about the conference, I looked them up myself. You never sent me an abstract or draft of your proposal or your presentation for the community college conference. In fact, and perhaps ironically, you did send the intellectual property agreement that was required for all conference participants. (See your email dated July 27, 2018; I have attached the agreement.) Your statement that this is not an intellectual property issue is inconsistent with how the conference organizers saw things, as shown in the intellectual property agreement. I wasn't initially upset about your role as sole author of the presentation because I assumed you'd be presenting your *own* work, as you did at NNN this past year when you and Felipe presented on a collaborative model for teaching introductory sociology.

With regard to the sole-authored paper, I was referring to the your email (8/5), below, when you stated that you "drafted this and intended to make it [your] own" and that you planned to prepare a "teaching note." A teaching note is a paper, of course.

With regard to the expansion of the grant, I had indicated that I did not want to apply for another grant or to usher in a new cohort of faculty for the NICHE/NICE project. But that's what you indicated you were thinking of doing when we spoke, and you even wrote in your email of November 27 that you were interested in doing a NICE Part II for very motivated faculty (⬛⬛⬛⬛⬛). You also mentioned that there were a lot of politics at Hostos, particularly with regard to ⬛⬛⬛, that part of the reason you were interested in the expansion was related to what was happening with the QR initiative at Hostos (e.g., your desire "not to be used") (December 3, 2018). We spoke on the phone, and you indicated that you were considering applying for your own grant, which I thought would be fine. I hoped you would do that, since it's entirely appropriate for you to apply for your own grant if you want to do something distinct from NICE, as you indicated you had planned. (It is also worth noting that you have given me very mixed messages about your intention of doing any kind of extension. Last fall you indicated that there were political issues and that you were hopeful about leaving Hostos. You applied to Gonzaga University and I wrote you a strong letter of reference. In April you withdrew from the DARE project because you said you didn't have time and wanted to focus attention this summer and fall semester on your book.)

In recent emails you seem to have changed the focus of this "expansion," and it seems that you are now strongly motivated to maximize the use of the data that I was responsible for generating from the NICE project (e.g., the faculty CAT scores, the discussion forums on math stories, etc.). As I have said repeatedly, it feels to me like you are not only taking my research ideas and presenting them as your own, but you are taking the data that I was responsible for generating and making plans to present this research as though it is something that you conceived. If you alone are applying for an extension of the NICE grant, this is the message you are sending about this line of inquiry--and it's not the right message. (From my perspective, because I conceived and planned this research, I feel I should have first dibs on the data.) I am fine with other people using the materials from the NICE/NICHE faculty development program—and indeed, I'm flattered when they do—because faculty development has always been important to me and I want to disseminate the materials as widely as possible. However, this shift in focus in your proposed "expansion," coupled with your presentation at the community college, has left me feeling worried and distrustful.

⬛⬛⬛

███

██ I feel like you are trying to take stabs at me and insulting my ability to work with people, when the faculty who have participated in my QR programs have become some of my closest colleagues. That aside, I have always valued your role in the "people side" of the program and I know you have very strong skills in that area. I've mentioned repeatedly throughout the program that I thought that was very helpful.

Like I said, I'm sorry things didn't work out, and I wish you the best.

Sincerely,

Esther

From: Sarah Hoiland [sarah.hoiland0927@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2019 5:36 PM
To: ESTHER.WILDER
Subject: Re: NNN Proposal 2019

Esther,

I never said I planned to write a sole-authored paper. In fact, I said exactly the opposite--that I had NO intention of writing a paper, sole-authored or otherwise.

We spoke on the phone and in person and I emailed you about an expansion project after hearing John Tsapogas, and you said you would be too busy with the new project but that you would be pleased if I proposed something and we agreed that Hostos would be a good site to do a Part II, which I would create. I shared my ideas with you and you encouraged me to reach out to the Program Officer. If you would like, I can send them to you again along with the emails I sent re. the presentation in FL.

I am not writing because I want to continue to collaborate or be a silent author with you and Rebecca on your upcoming article, but you are insulting my integrity based on misinformation and that goes beyond the grant or any presentations. We have worked together for three years, Esther, and I stuck by your side when all of our other key personnel vanished. I am honest and ethical. When I make a mistake, I admit it (and I did), and owned up to not including citations and acknowledging that I should have included you as a co-author in the presentation. Again, you didn't mention it when I sent you my list of presentations so I was taken aback at your reaction this summer. I played a vital role in the "people side" of this program and whether or not that has value to you, it has value on my campus and is evidenced by the number of faculty that completed the program.

Best,
Sarah

On Tue, Aug 6, 2019 at 3:36 PM ESTHER.WILDER <ESTHER.WILDER@lehman.cuny.edu> wrote:
Dear Sarah,

It is always conventional to give authorship credit or to cite if you are using someone else's work, whether in a presentation, a paper, or elsewhere -- whenever you use someone else's intellectual property. Dahlia was truly my co-author on that NNN presentation; we collaboratively conceived that specific research project, and we also worked together to generate and analyze the data for the presentation. Eduardo is a significant contributor to the intellectual foundation of the DARE project, but he was not involved in the survey research component. There was no subjectivity involved in deciding authorship. It was a matter of intellectual property and who rightfully owned the presentation.

P000446

In terms of authorship credit, it is also appropriate to include colleagues who have played a significant role in analyzing research data (as with Rebecca and Dene), even if they were not directly involved in the intellectual foundation of the project. I invited you to be a co-author on the NICHE/NICE paper because you have been instrumental in giving feedback and ushering faculty through the DARE program. Honestly, I was trying to be generous.

Now, however, you've indicated that you're planning a sole-authored paper that builds on slides that I wrote and data that I was responsible for generating. You've also said that you're planning an extension of the NICE project based on the grant proposal that I conceived and wrote. You never once suggested that the extension of the grant might include me.

I think it is time for us to wrap up this project and go our separate ways. As I said, I don't think you have the right to carry out an extension of a project that is essentially mine, and I really don't want to collaborate on a new project at this point. If you want to submit a new grant application, of course you can do that, and I wish you the best of luck in your work.

Sincerely,
Esther

From: Sarah Hoiland [sarah.hoiland0927@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2019 11:39 AM
To: ESTHER.WILDER
Subject: Re: NNN Proposal 2019

Esther,

I will respond to the issue of plagiarism raised in your email. The slides were not published as part of the conference proceedings nor did any paper come out of the presentation. To my knowledge, no names or bios for people that were not present were included on the "Speakers" page. I acknowledged your work in several places--from the outset the "Speakers" page bio says that I am one of two PIs (https://conferences.valenciacollege.edu/learning-assessment/speakers/sarah-hoiland/); during the presentation (I pointed you out in the photo and described your role), I showed the group the NSF page and described how NICE came from NICHE and that I entered a project that was already in place, and I remarked several times throughout the presentation that you created the structure when I showed the learning goals; and any conversations I had with folks afterward. I would estimate there were 20 faculty in the room.

While I realize none of what I said is in the PowerPoint and I acknowledge that I should have put this in writing in the slideshow, the slideshow is not published and I can assure you no one in the room thought that NICE was my project and each individual would have known your name and institutional affiliation. Clearly, I would not have sent the PowerPoint to you if my intention was to steal your work or take credit without acknowledging your work. I didn't know Frank created Unit 3 or which units Dene created, so I should have included them as well. Since the NSF proposal counts as a publication, I should have included that in a References page, and I acknowledge that omission as my error. My understanding of co-authorship is that it is for publications, and in the case of a presentation, published proceedings. In 10+ years of attending conferences, my experience has been authors who are not present are included in the conference program/ presentation when there is a co-authored publication being discussed or a publication that will come out of the presentation and when I sent you the list of conferences for our NSF Report, you did not make any mention of it. In fact, it didn't occur to me to include your name for NNN until you said something because I had planned to give a presentation (not write a paper). At last year's NNN, you presented on DARE and included Dahlia but not Eduardo and since both are co-PIs, I am not sure where the line is for acknowledgment and it must be subjective to some extent based on what you think your co-PIs contribute.

I am taking my RCR refresher and will pay close attention to the ethics and my intent has never been to take away your central role in the project or to claim ownership over the materials. I asked you if you wanted to co-present and you said no, but you appreciate me asking you and that "it's great that you're presenting" (email 7/27/18). I believe I even sent the abstract to you when I submitted it last summer.

With regard to the other items in the email (NNN, ASA, and expansion funding), I will think on them for a few days and get back to you.

Sarah

On Tue, Aug 6, 2019 at 3:13 AM ESTHER.WILDER <ESTHER.WILDER@lehman.cuny.edu> wrote:

Dear Sarah,

Regarding my suggestion for your own research, I was referring not to eventual completion, but to ushering faculty through the program in a timely way. I have been running faculty development programs parallel to NICE (including NICHE and Lehman's QR faculty development program) for more than 10 years now, and only about half of the NICE community college faculty completed the program in a timely fashion. (There were not enough NICHE community college faculty for me to draw any conclusions). I don't think it had anything to do with the level of commitment, but it's a challenge to run an intensive faculty development program at the community colleges, especially during the academic year, because everyone is so busy with other commitments, especially teaching. You may disagree, but I did not mean to offend you with the suggestion. It was not meant to be a commentary on the commitment of the community college faculty who participated in the program.

Of course you are welcome to do your own project on stereotype threat, but I would ask that you cite any documents that you use as information sources--the NICE syllabus, the Blackboard course site and related assignment, or the earlier papers that my NICHE team members and I completed, for instance. As you know, it's also important to use quotation marks for material that's taken verbatim from those documents.

The program data are all available to you, and you can use them however you like. Citing the documents (if you use them) is important, however, since so much of that material comes straight from the work I did earlier. When you sent me the slides you'd presented at the community college conference with you as sole author--and no mention of me--I was shocked at first and did not know quite how to respond. Many of your slides were taken verbatim from what I had written either in the proposal or in Blackboard, and I felt bad that you had not even acknowledged me. In your slide presentation (23 slides),

Slide 1 is a cover page.
Slide 2 (goals of NICE) consists entirely of text I had written.
Slides 3 and 4 are pictures.
Slide 5 is a description of the in-person workshop, which I planned in its entirety for NICHE, then adapted for NICE.
Slide 6 shows the CAT data for faculty, which I sent to you by email. The only differences are that you have reported the mean incorrectly (it's closer to 20 than 21) and that you reported the quartiles (which I haven't checked).
Slide 7 is a summary of the units for the NICHE/NICE program. With the exception of Unit 3, which was developed primarily by Frank Wang, these are all units I created. I also developed the structure of the program, which you outline on that slide.
Slides 8 to 13 are taken verbatim from the text I wrote for the Blackboard course.
Slides 14 to 19 show a sample NICE assessment exercise in criminal justice.
Slides 20 and 21 show data from a sociology course -- maybe yours?
Slides 22 and 23 are pictures from the workshop.

This discussion of each slide may seem picky, but I feel strongly (based on past experiences outside the NICHE/NICE context) that it's important to provide a citation in every case where your text or data are taken from a preexisting source--for both quotations and paraphrases. Coauthorship is also appropriate in cases where a significant amount of the material is taken from the work of another individual.

I would prefer that you submit your own separate application to NSF rather than apply for an extension of the NICE project. An extension of the NICE project is really an extension of the NICHE project, which I developed. As

https://mail.lehman.edu/owa/?ae=Item&t=IPM.Note&id=RgAAAABX...

it stands, I feel as if you are trying to take over a project that is mine. Of course I brought you in as a co-PI on the NICE project, and I think our work together has been successful in extending the reach of the program to more community college faculty. At the same time, I was genuinely surprised by the extent to which my NICHE and NICE work was used but not acknowledged in your presentation. I think the norm in this situation would be to include me as a co-author. I'm also disappointed that you're presenting on the data that were collected in response to my course design, and that I also have plans to present.

As I mentioned, I support your decision to pursue further work in the area of stereotype threat, and you may want to use the faculty we collaboratively recruited for the NICE program as your research participants.

Of course we'll be presenting together at the ASA workshop. If I can find a student, I will see if that works. If not, I will put together something on the materials the faculty submitted.

Best,
Esther

From: Sarah Hoiland [sarah.hoiland0927@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 05, 2019 12:37 PM
To: ESTHER.WILDER
Subject: Re: NNN Proposal 2019

Hi Esther,

Thank you for your insight and suggestions. I drafted this with the intention of making it my own and honing in on the math anxiety and stereotype threat components and using it as a springboard for an expansion cohort. It would be helpful to see anything you and Rebecca have for the other paper to know how to set it apart more, but I haven't been aware of any particular emphasis on this component and assumed you would take a more broad strokes approach to writing, whereas this is honing in on one particular unit. I plan to include a 1) close read analysis of the Discussion Forum on math stories, 2) follow-up interviews with a few faculty, and 3) some additional research I have done on stereotype threat (a paper is being published in the *Journal of Peer Learning* this summer).

The broad goals can definitely be omitted. I included them only to set the stage for the "Under the Tam" portion and I think this is relevant for 4-year faculty as well as 2-year faculty. ████████████
██

██ I presented the CAT scores at the Community College Assessment Conference last February and thought that was an interesting way to show the diverse levels of critical thinking among faculty participants.

10/23/2019, 3:27 PM

P000449

One line of inquiry could be what made the Hostos group so successful? We are a much smaller campus so the cohort is made up of colleagues who are also friends inside and outside the institution. We also have a strong culture of professional development and almost all participating faculty (w/ a few exceptions) participate in PD activities regularly. We could examine years of experience--Sandy, Felipe, Nelson, and Alisa have 15+ years at the college and Kate, Kathleen, Diana, and myself have 5+. Tanvir is the only "new" faculty member, I believe, w/ under 3 years of employment.

I thought a Teaching Note might be a good place to write about this and would be relatively less time consuming than a full article and additionally, I would like to propose an expansion cohort to our new Program Officer. I think stereotype threat at a 2-year HSI like Hostos would be really interesting and timely providing an opportunity for these faculty to go farther next summer with QR/QL.

Forgive the long email, but writing to you is helping me think about how I can merge the two ideas:

Perhaps I could focus on Hostos faculty: how the group itself created a safe space for exploring math anxiety among faculty as well as considering stereotype threat among a predominantly minority faculty (6/11 are racial/ ethnic minorities and 8/11 are female-identified). A close reading of the math anxiety posts and follow-up interviews would be feasible prior to October and might also provide some data for our Final Report and was included in our IRB. Then I could use this to write a proposal for expansion funding for a Summer 2020 Hostos cohort.

Thanks again for taking the time. Your feedback is always very incisive.

Best,
Sarah

On Fri, Aug 2, 2019 at 10:20 PM ESTHER.WILDER <ESTHER.WILDER@lehman.cuny.edu> wrote:
Hi, Sarah.

I think there's a lot of overlap between this proposal and the one I've been working on with Rebecca over the past several years. I also wouldn't write "Professor Wilder will not be at NNN this year." People present all the time with co-authors who are not in attendance, and I don't think that's unusual or even worth mentioning.

I think you will want this paper (or note) to be complementary to the one Rebecca and I have been working on. (You'll remember that I invited you to be an author on that one. We are still working on the paper and will probably wrap it up sometime in the fall.) It covers many of the same items addressed in this paper -- the structure of the faculty development program, changes in the faculty's comfort teaching QR, and so forth. I also think you will want to make this paper/presentation one that you really own, especially if you are going to be the first author. If you focus more on your unique contributions to the project, you'll end up with a paper that (a) is more distinct from the other papers associated with the project and (b) provides a greater opportunity to discuss your own experiences with those in attendance.

For example, toward the end of the NICHE program, my co-PI Frank Wang wrote two papers about Students' Bayesian Reasoning Skills, but they were almost entirely based on the unit he had developed for the NICHE program. I encouraged him to do that because he had "ownership" of that unit/material due to his background and experiences. He and I coauthored one of the papers, since he felt it was important to acknowledge my role in creating the program, but much of the paper was specific to his part of the project. I think the situation is

similar here. I'd ask that you focus less on the broad goals of the project, which will be presented in other papers, and more on the elements that you were most directly involved with. I see from the slideshow you sent me yesterday that parts of the presentation are clearly specific to Hostos, and you'll probably want to emphasis those elements more.

One idea: You might want to focus on the challenges of ushering faculty, especially community college faculty, through this kind of faculty development program. (For instance, What were the obstacles you faced? How did you try to overcome them? To what extent were you successful? Were there differences between community college faculty and four-year college faculty in the percentage who completed the program?) This is important stuff, and I think you'd have a good audience for it. Also, this aspect of the project is something that hasn't been presented before, and it doesn't overlap so much with the other papers that have been completed or are in progress.

Best wishes,
Esther

From: Sarah Hoiland (via Google Docs) [sarah.hoiland0927@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, August 02, 2019 3:54 PM
To: ESTHER.WILDER
Subject: NNN Proposal 2019

sarah.hoiland0927@gmail.com has shared a link to the following document:

NNN Proposal 2019

Hi Esther,

Here is what I would like to submit to Eric for NNN. Any comments or suggestions would be greatly appreciated.

Best,
Sarah

Open in Docs

Google Docs: Create and edit documents online.

Google LLC, 1600 Amphitheatre Parkway, Mountain View, CA 94043, USA

You have received this email because someone shared a document with you from Google Docs.